arXiv:1204.3359v1 [math.AP] 16 Apr 2012

Multiple solutions for a nonhomogeneous Schrödinger-Maxwell system in $\mathbb{R}^3$

Yongsheng Jiang, Zhengping Wang and Huan-Song Zhou [*]

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences
P.O. Box 71010, Wuhan 430071, P.R. China

Abstract: The paper considers the following nonhomogeneous Schrödinger-Maxwell system

$$(SM) \qquad \begin{cases} -\Delta u + u + \lambda\phi(x)u = |u|^{p-1}u + g(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ -\Delta\phi = u^2, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda > 0$, $p \in (1,5)$ and $g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus \{0\}$. There seems no any results on the existence of multiple solutions to problem (SM) for $p \in (1,3]$. In this paper, we find that there is a constant$C_p > 0$ such that problem (SM) has at least two solutions for all $p \in (1,5)$ provided $\|g\|_{L^2} \le C_p$, but only for $p \in (1,2]$ we need $\lambda > 0$ is small. Moreover, $C_p = \frac{(p-1)}{2p}[\frac{(p+1)S^{p+1}}{2p}]^{1/(p-1)}$, where S is the Sobolev constant.

Keywords: Multiple solutions, nonhomogeneous, Schrödinger-Maxwell system.
2010 Mathematical Subject Classification: 35J20, 35J60.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we are concerned with the existence of multiple solutions for the following nonhomogeneous Schrödinger-Maxwell system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u + \lambda\phi(x)u = |u|^{p-1}u + g(x), \ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ -\Delta\phi = u^2, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter, $p \in (1,5)$ and $g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Problem (1.1) is related to the study of nonlinear Schrödinger equation for a particle in an electromagnetic field. For more details on the physical aspects about the problem we refer the reader to [5, 16] and the references therein. If $g(x) \equiv 0$, the existence of solutions to problem (1.1) has been discussed under different ranges of p, for examples, [8] [9] [10] for $p \in [3,5)$, [4] for $p \in (2,5)$,

---

[*] Corresponding author: hszhou@wipm.ac.cn; Phone: +86-27-87199196; Fax: +86-27-87199291. This work was supported by NSFC(10801132, 11071245 and 11126313)

[13] for $p \in [2,3)$ and [2] [3] [15] for $p \in (1,5)$ or general nonlinearity, etc. Some recent results in this direction was summarized in [1]. However, if $g(x) \not\equiv 0$, only a few results are known for problem (1.1) when $p \in (3,5)$. In [16], three radially symmetric solutions of (1.1) were obtained for $p \in (3,5)$ and $\|g\|_{L^2}$ is small enough. In [7, 18], the authors considered problem (1.1) with certain potential and the existence of multiple solutions is established for $p \in (3,5)$. To the authors' knowledge, it is still open whether the problem (1.1) has multiple solutions under $p \in (1,3]$ and $g(x) \not\equiv 0$. The aim of this paper is to prove that problem (1.1) has at least two solutions for all $p \in (1,5)$ and $\|g\|_{L^2}$ is suitably small.

For $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, let ϕ_u be the unique solution of $-\Delta\phi = u^2$ in $D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, then

$$\phi_u(x) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int \frac{u^2(y)}{|x-y|}dy, \tag{1.2}$$

here and in what follows, we denote $\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}$ simply by $\int$. Define the energy functional $I_\lambda : H^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla u|^2 + u^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int \phi_u u^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int |u|^{p+1}dx - \int g(x)u dx. \tag{1.3}$$

If $g(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $p \in [1,5]$, it is known that $I \in C^1(H^1(\mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R})$ and for any $\varphi \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$,

$$\langle I'_\lambda(u), \varphi\rangle = \int \nabla u \nabla\varphi + u\varphi dx + \lambda\int \phi_u u\varphi dx - \int |u|^{p-1}u\varphi dx - \int g(x)\varphi dx. \tag{1.4}$$

Furthermore, if $g(x) = g(|x|)$ and $u \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ satisfies $I'_\lambda(u)\varphi = 0$ for all $\varphi \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, Lemma 2.4 of [9] showed that (u, ϕ_u) satisfies (1.1) in the weak sense. For simplicity, in many cases we just say $u \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, instead of $(u, \phi_u) \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \times D^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^3)$, is a weak solution of (1.1).

For all $\lambda > 0$, $p \in (1,5)$ and $\|g\|_{L^2}$ suitably small, it is not difficult to get a solution u_0 of (1.1) by the Ekeland's variational principle. Moreover, u_0 is a local minimizer of I_λ and of negative energy, that is, $I_\lambda(u_0) < 0$. To get a solution of (1.1) with positive energy, we have to study the problem (1.1) in the following two cases: $p \in (2,5)$ and $p \in (1,2]$, respectively.

When $p \in (2,5)$, by using the transform $w_t(x) = t^2 w(tx)$ for some $w \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $t > 0$ large enough, we can show that I_λ satisfies the mountain pass geometry for any $\lambda > 0$ (see Lemma 3.1) and get a $(PS)_c (c > 0)$ sequence $\{u_n\}$ of I_λ. For $p \in [3,5)$, it is easy to prove the boundedness of $\{u_n\}$ and the (PS) condition. But for $p \in (2,3)$, it is still not clear if the (PS) condition holds. To overcome this difficulty in the case of $g(x) \equiv 0$, Ruiz [15] introduced an interesting manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and then proved that there exists a positive radial function $\tilde{u}$ such that $0 < I_\lambda(\tilde{u}) = \inf\{I_\lambda(u) : u \in \mathcal{M}\}$ and $I'_\lambda(\tilde{u}) = 0$. Using this manifold $\mathcal{M}$ and the concentration compactness principle, Azzollini and Pomponio [4] established the existence of a ground state for problem (1.1) under

$g(x) \equiv 0$ and $p \in (2,5)$. However, the method used in [4, 15] does not apply to (1.1) when $g(x) \not\equiv 0$. In this paper, by introducing a suitable approximation problem, we try to use the Theorem 1.1 of [11] to get a special (PS) sequence for I_λ based on the weak solutions of the approximation problem, then to show that this special (PS) sequence converges to a solution of problem (1.1) in the case of $g(x) \not\equiv 0$. We should mention that this kind of idea has been used in [2] to get multiple solutions to (1.1) in the case of $g(x) \equiv 0$ and $p \in (2,5)$. However, when $g(x) \not\equiv 0$ we cannot prove the boundedness of a (PS) sequence by following similar idea as those of Lemma 2.6 in [2], here we have to use an indirect method to do that, see our proof of Lemma 3.2.

However when $p \in (1,2]$, we note that (1.1) has no any positive energy solution for $\lambda > 0$ large enough (see Theorem 4.1). Based on this observation, by using the cut-off technique as in [12](see also [3, 14]) and combining some delicate analysis, we finally get a positive energy solution for problem (1.1) with $\lambda > 0$ small.

Notations: Throughout this paper, we denote the standard norms of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)$ by $||\cdot||$ and $|\cdot|_p$, respectively.

For $p \in [1,5]$, by Sobolev embedding theorem, we have

$$\inf_{|u|_{p+1}=1} \|u\| \triangleq S > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Let

$$C_p = \frac{(p-1)}{2p}\left(\frac{(p+1)S^{p+1}}{2p}\right)^{1/(p-1)}. \tag{1.6}$$

Our main results are as follows:

Theorem 1.1 *If $p \in (2,5)$ and $g(x) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is a nonnegative function satisfying*

(G1)*: $g(x) = g(|x|) \not\equiv 0$.*

(G2)*: $\langle \nabla g(x), x \rangle \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$.*

(G3)*: $|g|_2 < C_p$, where C_p given by (1.6).*

Then, for all $\lambda > 0$, problem (1.1) has at least two nontrivial solutions $\tilde{u}_0$ and $\tilde{u}_1$ such that $I_\lambda(\tilde{u}_0) < 0 < I_\lambda(\tilde{u}_1)$.

Theorem 1.2 *If $p \in (1,2]$, $g(x)$ satisfies* (G1) *and* (G3)*. Then, only for $\lambda > 0$ small, problem (1.1) has two nontrivial solutions $\tilde{u}_0$ and $\tilde{u}_1$ with property $I_\lambda(\tilde{u}_0) < 0 < I_\lambda(\tilde{u}_1)$. For $\lambda > 0$ large enough, problem (1.1) has no any solution with positive energy.*

2 A weak solution with negative energy

The aim of this section is to get a weak solution with negative energy to problem (1.1), for any $\lambda > 0$ and $p \in (1,5)$. With the aid of Ekeland's variational principle, this weak solution is obtained by seeking a local minimum of the energy functional I_λ.

Lemma 2.1 *Let* $p \in (1,5)$ *and* $|g|_2 < C_p$ *with* C_p *given by (1.6). Then for the energy functional* I_λ *defined by (1.3), there exist* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $\rho > 0$ *such that*

$$I_\lambda(u) \geq \rho > 0, \textit{ for all } \lambda > 0 \textit{ and } \|u\| = \alpha.$$

Proof: For all $\lambda > 0$ and $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$, by Sobolev embedding theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(u) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{1}{(p+1)A_p}\|u\|^{p+1} - |g|_2\|u\| \\ &= \|u\|(\frac{1}{2}\|u\| - \frac{1}{(p+1)A_p}\|u\|^p - |g|_2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where S_1 and A_p are given by (1.5) and (1.6).

Set $h(t) = \frac{1}{2}t - \frac{1}{(p+1)A_p}t^p$ for $t \geq 0$. By direct calculations, we see that

$$\max_{t\geq 0} h(t) = h(\alpha) = C_p,$$

where $\alpha = [(p+1)S^{p+1}/2p]^{1/(p-1)}$. Then it follows from (2.1) that if $|g|_2 < C_p$, there exists $\rho = \alpha(h(\alpha) - |g|_2) > 0$ such that $I_\lambda(u)|_{\|u\|=\alpha} \geq \rho > 0$ for all $\lambda > 0$. $\square$

Theorem 2.1 *If* $p \in (1,5)$, $0 \leq g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3) \setminus \{0\}$ *and* $|g|_2 < C_p$, C_p *is given by (1.6). Then for any* $\lambda > 0$, *there exists* $u_0 \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *such that*

$$I_\lambda(u_0) = \inf\{I_\lambda(u) : u \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \text{ and } \|u\| \leq \alpha\} < 0, \tag{2.2}$$

where α *is given by Lemma 2.1. Moreover,* u_0 *is a solution of problem (1.1).*

Proof: Since $g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$, $g(x) \geq 0$ and $g(x) \not\equiv 0$, we can choose a function $v \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\int g(x)vdx > 0$. Then for $t > 0$ small enough, we have

$$I_\lambda(tv) = \frac{t^2}{2}\int |\nabla v|^2 + v^2 dx + \frac{\lambda t^4}{4}\int \phi_v v^2 dx - \frac{t^{p+1}}{p+1}\int |v|^{p+1}dx - t\int g(x)vdx < 0.$$

This shows that $c_0 := \inf\{I_\lambda(u) : u \in \bar{B}_\alpha\} < 0$, where $\bar{B}_\alpha = \{u \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) : \|u\| \leq \alpha\}$. By Ekeland's variational principle, there exists $\{u_n\} \subset \bar{B}_\alpha$ such that

(i) $c_0 \leq I_\lambda(u_n) \leq c_0 + \frac{1}{n}$, and (ii) $I_\lambda(w) \geq I_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{n}\|w - u_n\|$ for all $w \in \bar{B}_\alpha$.

From a standard procedure, see for example [19], we can prove that $\{u_n\}$ is a bounded (PS) sequence of I_λ. Then by the compactness of the embedding $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)(2 < p < 6)$, there exists $u_0 \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $u_n \overset{n}{\to} u_0$ strongly in $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Hence $I_\lambda(u_0) = c_0 < 0$ and $I'_\lambda(u_0) = 0$. $\square$

3 Positive energy solution for $p \in (2,5)$

In this section, we aim to prove that problem (1.1) has a mountain pass type (positive energy) solution for any $\lambda > 0$ and $p \in (2,5)$. As is known, it is not easy to show that a (PS) sequence of the functional I_λ is bounded when $p \in (1,3)$ because of the appearance of nonlocal term of (1.2). In particular, $p \in (1,2]$ is the hardest case, which we will be deal with in the following section. To show the boundedness of a (PS) sequence of I_λ in the case of $p \in (2,5)$, it is also nontrivial. Here we have to use a theorem of [11], which is essentially based on Struwe's monotonicity trick [17] and it has been successfully used to handle many homogeneous elliptic problems, for examples, [2, 3] and the references therein. Motivated by these papers, we apply this theorem to solve our inhomogeneous elliptic problem (1.1). Let us recall the abstract theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *[11, Theorem 1.1] Let $(X, \|\cdot\|)$ be a Banach space, $J \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ an interval and $(I_\mu)_{\mu\in J}$ a family of C^1-functionals on X of the form*

$$I_\mu(u) = A(u) - \mu B(u),\ \forall\ \mu \in J,$$

where $B(u) \geq 0$, $\forall\ u \in X$ and $B(u) \to +\infty$ or $A(u) \to +\infty$ as $\|u\| \to \infty$. Assume that there are two points $v_1, v_2 \in X$ such that

$$c(\mu) := \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_\mu(\gamma(t)) > \max\{I_\mu(v_1), I_\mu(v_2)\},\ \text{for } \mu \in J,$$

where

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], X) : \gamma(0) = v_1, \gamma(1) = v_2\}.$$

Then, for almost every $\mu \in J$, there is a sequence $\{v_n\} \subset X$ such that **(i)** *$\{v_n\}$ is bounded,* **(ii)** *$I_\mu(v_n) \to c(\mu)$,* **(iii)** *$I'_\mu(v_n) \to 0$ in the dual of X.*

In order to applying Theorem 3.1 to get a solution to our problem (3.1), we introduce, for any fixed$\lambda > 0$, the following approximation problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + u + \lambda\phi(x)u = \mu|u|^{p-1}u + g(x),\ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ -\Delta\phi = u^2,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, $p \in (2,5)$ and $g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Let $X = H^1_r(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $J = [1/2, 1]$, and define $I_{\lambda,\mu} : X \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(u) = A(u) - \mu B(u), \text{with}$$

$$A(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla u|^2 + u^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int \phi_u u^2 dx - \int g(x)u dx,\ B(u) = \frac{1}{p+1}\int |u|^{p+1} dx.$$

Then $(I_{\lambda,\mu})_{\mu\in J}$ is a family of C^1-functionals on X, $B(u) \geq 0$, $\forall\ u \in X$ and $A(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2 - |g|_2\|u\| \to +\infty$ as $\|u\| \to \infty$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\lambda > 0$ be fixed. Assume that $p \in (2,5)$, $0 \leq (\not\equiv) g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $|g|_2 < C_p$ with C_p given by (1.6), then*

(i) *There exist* $a, b > 0$ *and* $e \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *with* $\|e\| > b$ *such that*

$$I_{\lambda,\mu}(u) \geq a > 0 \quad \textit{with } \|u\| = b \quad \textit{and} \quad I_{\lambda,\mu}(e) < 0 \quad \textit{for all } \mu \in [1/2, 1].$$

(ii) *For any* $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, *we have*

$$c_{\lambda,\mu} := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \max_{t \in [0,1]} I_{\lambda,\mu}(\gamma(t)) > \max\{I_{\lambda,\mu}(0), I_{\lambda,\mu}(e)\},$$

where $\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e\}$.

Proof: (i) Since $I_{\lambda,\mu}(u) \geq I_{\lambda,1}(u)$ for all $u \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, by Lemma 2.1 there exist $a, b > 0$, which are independent of $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, such that $I_{\lambda,1}(u) \geq a > 0$ with $\|u\| = b$.

We choose a function $w \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \geq (\not\equiv)0$. Setting $w_t(x) = t^2 w(tx)$ for $t > 0$, then we have for all $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,\mu}(w_t) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla w_t|^2 + w_t^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int \phi_{w_t} w_t^2 dx - \frac{1}{2(p+1)}\int |w_t|^{p+1} dx \\ &= \frac{t^3}{2}\int |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{t}{2}\int w^2 dx + \frac{\lambda t^3}{4}\int \phi_w w^2 dx - \frac{t^{2p-1}}{2(p+1)}\int |w|^{p+1} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $p \in (2, 5)$, there exists $t_0 > 0$ large enough, which is independent of $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, such that $I_{\lambda,\mu}(w_{t_0}) < 0$ for all $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$. Hence, (i) holds by taking $e = w_{t_0}$.

(ii) By the definition of $c_{\lambda,\mu}$, we have for all $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$,

$$c_{\lambda,\mu} \geq c_{\lambda,1} \geq a > 0,$$

where $a > 0$ is given in (i). Since $I_{\lambda,\mu}(0) = 0$ and $I_{\lambda,\mu}(e) < 0$ for all $\mu \in [1/2, 1]$, we see that (ii) holds. □

By Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.1, there exists $\{\mu_j\} \subset [1/2, 1]$ such that

(i) $\mu_j \to 1$ as $j \to +\infty$, and

(ii) I_{λ,μ_j} has a bounded (PS) sequence $\{u_n^j\}$ at the level c_{λ,μ_j}.

Since the embedding $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^3)(2 < p < 6)$ is compact, we can show that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $u_j \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $u_n^j \overset{n}{\to} u_j$ strongly in $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and u_j is a solution of problem (3.1) with $\mu = \mu_j$. Moreover, we have

$$0 < a \leq I_{\lambda,\mu_j}(u_j) = c_{\lambda,\mu_j} \leq c_{\lambda,\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } I'_{\lambda,\mu_j}(u_j) = 0, \text{ for all } j \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.2}$$

Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, following the argument in [6], we can prove that u_j satisfies the following type of Pohozaev identity

$$\int \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u_j|^2 + \frac{3}{2}u_j^2 + \frac{5}{4}\lambda\phi_{u_j} u_j^2 dx = \int \frac{3\mu_j}{p+1}|u_j|^{p+1} + (3g(x) + \langle x, \nabla g(x)\rangle)\, u_j dx. \tag{3.3}$$

In what follows, we turn to showing that $\{u_j\}$ converges to a solution of problem (1.1). For this purpose, it is necessary to prove that $\{u_j\}$ is bounded in $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$. If $g(x) \equiv 0$, this can be done directly by solving the system of linear equations (3.2) and (3.3) for $\{|u_j|_2\}$ and $\{|\nabla u_j|_2\}$. However, if $g(x) \not\equiv 0$, this method seems not work well. Here we introduce a new system based on (3.2) and (3.3), then argue by contradiction.

Lemma 3.2 *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1, if $p \in (2,5)$, then $\{u_j\}$ is bounded in $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.*

Proof: We prove the lemma by the following two steps.

Step 1. $\{|u_j|_2\}$ is bounded.

By contradiction, we assume that $|u_j|_2 \xrightarrow{j} +\infty$. Let $v_j = \frac{u_j}{|u_j|_2}$, $X_j = \int |\nabla v_j|^2 dx$, $Y_j = \lambda |u_j|_2^2 \int \phi_{v_j} v_j^2 dx$ and $Z_j = \mu_j |v_j|_{p+1}^{p+1} |u_j|_2^{p-1}$. It follows from (3.2) that

$$\begin{cases} \int \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u_j|^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_j^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi_{u_j} u_j^2 dx - \frac{\mu_j}{p+1}\int |u_j|^{p+1}dx - \int g(x)u_j dx = c_{\lambda,\mu_j}, \\ \int |\nabla u_j|^2 + u_j^2 + \lambda \phi_{u_j} u_j^2 dx - \int g(x) u_j dx = \mu_j \int |u_j|^{p+1}, \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

and $\{c_{\lambda,\mu_j}\}$ is bounded. Note that $g(x), \langle \nabla g(x), x\rangle \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$. Multiplying (3.3) and (3.4) by $\frac{1}{|u_j|_2^2}$, we see that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}X_j + \frac{1}{4}Y_j - \frac{1}{p+1}Z_j = -\frac{1}{2} + o(1), \\ \frac{1}{2}X_j + \frac{5}{4}Y_j - \frac{3}{p+1}Z_j = -\frac{3}{2} + o(1), \\ X_j + Y_j - Z_j = -1 + o(1), \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

where $o(1)$ denotes the quantity tends to zero as $j \to +\infty$. For $p \in (2,5)$, solving(3.5) we have

$$X_j = \frac{p-1}{2(2-p)} + o(1).$$

This is a contradiction for j large enough since $X_j \geq 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, for $p \in (2,5)$, $\{|u_j|_2\}$ is bounded.

Step 2. $\{|\nabla u_j|_2\}$ is bounded.

Similar to the proof of Step 1, we assume by contradiction that $|\nabla u_j|_2 \xrightarrow{j} +\infty$. Let $w_j = \frac{u_j}{|\nabla u_j|_2}$, $M_j = \lambda |\nabla u_j|_2^2 \int \phi_{w_j} w_j^2 dx$ and $N_j = \mu_j |w_j|_{p+1}^{p+1} |\nabla u_j|_2^{p-1}$, then multiplying (3.4) by $\frac{1}{|\nabla u_j|_2^2}$ and noting that $\{|u_j|_2\}$ is bounded, we get

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}M_j - \frac{1}{p+1}N_j = -\frac{1}{2} + o(1), \\ \frac{5}{4}M_j - \frac{3}{p+1}N_j = -\frac{1}{2} + o(1), \\ M_j - N_j = -1 + o(1). \end{cases} \tag{3.6}$$

From the first and second equations of (3.6), we have

$$M_j = 2 + o(1), \quad N_j = p + 1 + o(1).$$

This and the third equation of (3.6) implies that $p = 2 + o(1)$. So, if $p \neq 2$, we see that (3.6) is impossible. Thus, for $p \in (2,5)$, $\{|\nabla u_j|_2\}$ is bounded. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1: By Lemma 3.2 we can show that $\{u_j\}$ is a bounded (PS) sequence of I_λ. Then by the compactness of the embedding $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)(2 < p < 5)$, it follows that for any $\lambda > 0$, problem (1.1) has a solution u_1 satisfying $I_\lambda(u_1) > 0$. Thus, combining Theorem 2.1, we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

4 Positive energy solution for $p \in (1, 2]$

In this section, we claim first that problem (1.1) with $1 < p \leq 2$ has no any solution with positive energy for $\lambda > 0$ large enough.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume that* $p \in (1, 2]$ *and* $g(x) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$*(may not be radially symmetric). Then problem (1.1) has no any solution with positive energy if* $\lambda > 0$ *is large enough.*

Proof: Let $w \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ be a solution of problem (1.1). Then $\langle I'_\lambda(w), w\rangle = 0$ and

$$I_\lambda(w) = -\left\{\frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla w|^2 + w^2 dx + \frac{3\lambda}{4}\int \phi_w w^2 dx - \frac{p}{p+1}\int |w|^{p+1} dx\right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

By (20) of [15], we have

$$\sqrt{\lambda/8}\int |w|^3 dx \leq \frac{1}{4}\int |\nabla w|^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{8}\int \phi_w w^2 dx. \quad (4.2)$$

For $p \in (1, 2]$ and $\lambda > 0$ large enough, it follows from (4.1) and (4.2) that

$$I_\lambda(w) \leq -\left\{\int \frac{1}{2}w^2 + \sqrt{\lambda/2}|w|^3 - \frac{p}{p+1}|w|^{p+1} dx\right\} < 0.$$

Hence, problem (1.1) must have no any solution with positive energy if $\lambda > 0$ is large enough. □

When $p \in (1, 2]$, Theorem 4.1 implies that we may find a solution with positive energy to problem (1.1) only for $\lambda > 0$ small. In this case, to get a bounded $(\mathrm{PS})_c(c > 0)$ sequence of I_λ, following [12] we introduce the cut-off function $\eta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^+)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \eta(t) = 1, \text{ for } t \in [0, 1], \\ 0 \leq \eta(t) \leq 1, \text{ for } t \in (1, 2), \\ \eta(t) = 0, \text{ for } t \in [2, +\infty), \\ |\eta'|_\infty \leq 2, \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

and consider the modified functional $I_{\lambda,M} : H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$I_{\lambda,M}(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int |\nabla u|^2 + u^2 dx + \frac{\lambda}{4}\int \psi_M(u)\phi_u u^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int |u|^{p+1} dx - \int g(x)u dx, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\psi_M(u) = \eta(\frac{\|u\|^2}{M^2})$ for $M > 0$. If $g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and $p \in [1, 5]$, we have $I_{\lambda,M} \in C^1(H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3), \mathbb{R})$ for each $\lambda, M > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle I'_{\lambda,M}(u), \varphi\rangle &= \int \nabla u \nabla\varphi + u\varphi dx + \lambda\psi_M(u)\int \phi_u u\varphi dx \\ &+ \frac{\lambda}{2}\eta'(\frac{\|u\|^2}{M^2})\frac{1}{M^2}\int \phi_u u^2 dx \int \nabla u\nabla\varphi + u\varphi dx \\ &- \int |u|^{p-1}u\varphi dx - \int g(x)\varphi dx, \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

for any $\varphi \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Lemma 4.1 *Assume that* $p \in (1, 5)$, $0 \le (\not\equiv) g(x) = g(|x|) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *and* $|g|_2 < C_p$ *with* C_p *given by (1.6). Then the functional* $I_{\lambda,M}$ *satisfies*
(i) $I_{\lambda,M}|_{\|u\|=\alpha} > \rho > 0$ *for all* $\lambda, M > 0$,
(ii) *For each* $M > 0$, *there exists* $e_M \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ *with* $\|e_M\| > \alpha$ *such that* $I_{\lambda,M}(e_M) < 0$ *for all* $\lambda > 0$,
where α, ρ *are given in Lemma 2.1.*

Proof: (i) The proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.1.

(ii) We choose a function $0 \le v_1 \in H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\|v_1\| = 1$. By (4.3) and (4.4), for each $M > 0$, there exists $t_M \ge 2M > 0$ large enough such that $\psi_M(t_M v_1) = 0$ and $I_{\lambda,M}(t_M v_1) < 0$. Hence, (ii) holds by taking $e_M = t_M v_1$. $\square$

Define

$$c_{\lambda,M} = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{\lambda,M}} \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda,M}(\gamma(t)),$$

where $\Gamma_{\lambda,M} := \{\gamma \in C([0, 1], H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)) : \gamma(0) = 0, \gamma(1) = e_M\}$. Then by Lemma 4.1, we have

$$c_{\lambda,M} \ge \rho > 0 \text{ for all } \lambda, M > 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Furthermore, applying mountain pass theorem, there exists $\{u^n_{\lambda,M}\} \subset H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that

$$I_{\lambda,M}(u^n_{\lambda,M}) \xrightarrow{n} c_{\lambda,M} \text{ and } (1 + \|u^n_{\lambda,M}\|)\|I'_{\lambda,M}(u^n_{\lambda,M})\|_{H_r^{-1}} \xrightarrow{n} 0. \tag{4.7}$$

where H_r^{-1} denotes the dual space of $H_r^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$.

Lemma 4.2 *Under the conditions of Lemma 4.1, let* $\{u^n_{\lambda,M}\}$ *be given by (4.7), then there exists* $M_0 > 0$ *such that*

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|u^n_{\lambda,M_0}\| \le M_0/2, \quad \text{for all } 0 < \lambda < M_0^{-3}.$$

Proof: Motivated by [14], we prove the lemma by contradiction. Assume that, for every $M > 0$, there exists $\lambda_M \in (0, M^{-3})$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|u^n_{\lambda_M,M}\| > M/2. \tag{4.8}$$

For simplicity, we denote $u^n_{\lambda_M,M}$ by u_n. By (4.8) and up to a subsequence, we get $\|u_n\| \geq M/2$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

From (4.4) and (4.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& I_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n) - \frac{1}{p+1}\langle I'_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n), u_n\rangle \\
= \;& (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1})\|u_n\|^2 + (\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{p+1})\lambda_M \int \psi_M(u_n)\phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx \\
- \;& \frac{\lambda_M}{2(p+1)}\eta'(\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2})\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2}\int \phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx - \frac{p}{p+1}\int g(x)u_n dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1})\|u_n\|^2 - \frac{1}{p+1}\|I'_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n)\|_{H_r^{-1}}\|u_n\| \\
\leq \;& (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1})\|u_n\|^2 + \frac{1}{p+1}\langle I'_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n), u_n\rangle \\
= \;& I_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n) + \frac{3-p}{4(p+1)}\lambda_M \int \psi_M(u_n)\phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx \\
+ \;& \frac{\lambda_M}{2(p+1)}\eta'(\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2})\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2}\int \phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx + \frac{p}{p+1}\int g(x)u_n dx. \qquad (4.9)
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.7), we have $I_{\lambda_M,M}(u_n) = c_{\lambda_M,M} + o(1)$, here $o(1)$ denotes the quantity tends to zero as $n \to +\infty$.

We claim that there exist $M_1, C_1, D_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_{\lambda_M,M} \leq C_1\lambda_M M^4 + D_1, \text{ for all } M \geq M_1. \qquad (4.10)$$

Let v_1 be the function taken in the proof of Lemma 4.1 (ii), by (4.4) we have

$$I_{\lambda_M,M}(2Mv_1) \leq 2M^2 - \frac{2^{p+1}}{p+1}|v_1|^{p+1}_{p+1}M^{p+1}. \qquad (4.11)$$

Then there exists $M_1 > 0$ such that $I_{\lambda_M,M}(2Mv_1) < 0$ for all $M \geq M_1$. Thus,

$$c_{\lambda_M,M} \leq \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda_M,M}(t2Mv_1), \text{ for all } M \geq M_1. \qquad (4.12)$$

By (4.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{t\in[0,1]} I_{\lambda_M,M}(t2Mv_1) \\
\leq \;& \max_{t\in[0,1]}\{2(Mt)^2 - \frac{2^{p+1}}{p+1}|v_1|^{p+1}_{p+1}(Mt)^{p+1}\} + \max_{t\in[0,1]}\{\frac{\lambda_M}{4}(2tM)^4\int \phi_{v_1} v_1^2 dx\} \\
\leq \;& \max_{s\geq 0}\{2s^2 - \frac{2^{p+1}}{p+1}|v_1|^{p+1}_{p+1}s^{p+1}\} + C_1\lambda_M M^4 \\
= \;& D_1 + C_1\lambda_M M^4. \qquad (4.13)
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (4.12) and (4.13) that (4.10) holds.

By the inequality $\int \phi_u u^2 dx \leq C\|u\|^4$ for any $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^3)$ (see [15]) and noting that $\psi_M(u_n) = 0$ for $\|u_n\|^2 \geq 2M^2$, it is easy to see that

$$\int \psi_M(u_n)\phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx \leq CM^4, \tag{4.14}$$

and

$$\eta'(\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2})\frac{\|u_n\|^2}{M^2}\int \phi_{u_n} u_n^2 dx \leq CM^4. \tag{4.15}$$

Combining (4.7), (4.9), (4.10) (4.14) and (4.15), we get for all $M \geq M_1$,

$$(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1})\|u_n\|^2 \leq C_2\lambda_M M^4 + D_2 + \frac{p}{p+1}\int g(x)u_n dx, \tag{4.16}$$

where $C_2, D_2 > 0$ independent of M. Then using the inequality $\int g(x)u_n dx \leq \epsilon\|u_n\|^2 + C(\epsilon, |g|_2)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ and (4.16), we deduce that there exist $C_3, D_3 > 0$ independent of M such that for all $M \geq M_1$,

$$\|u_n\|^2 \leq C_3\lambda_M M^4 + D_3. \tag{4.17}$$

Since $\lambda_M \leq M^{-3}$ and $\|u_n\| \geq \frac{M}{2}$, (4.17) is impossible for $M > 0$ large enough. Thus we complete the proof of this lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2: By Lemma 4.2 and (4.3)-(4.5), we see that $\{u^n_{\lambda,M_0}\} \subset H^1_r(\mathbb{R}^3)$ is a bounded (PS) sequence of I_λ for all $0 < \lambda < M_0^{-3}$. Moreover, from (4.6) and (4.7) we have

$$I_\lambda(u^n_{\lambda,M_0}) = I_{\lambda,M_0}(u^n_{\lambda,M_0}) \xrightarrow{n} c_{\lambda,M_0} \geq \rho > 0.$$

Since the embedding $H^1_r(\mathbb{R}^3) \hookrightarrow L^{p+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)(1 < p < 5)$ is compact, it follows that for any $0 < \lambda < M_0^{-3}$, problem (1.1) has a solution $\tilde{u}_1$ satisfying $I_\lambda(\tilde{u}_1) > 0$. Then by Theorems 2.1 and 4.1 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti. On Schrödinger-Poisson Systems. *Milan J. Math*, 76(1):257–274, 2008.

[2] A. Ambrosetti and D. Ruiz. Multiple bound states for the Schrödinger Poisson problem. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 10(3):391–404, 2008.

[3] A. Azzollini, P. d'Avenia, and A. Pomponio. On the Schrödinger Maxwell equations under the effect of a general nonlinear term. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non linéaire*, 27(2):779–791, 2010.

[4] A. Azzollini and A. Pomponio. Ground state solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger Maxwell equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 345(1):90–108, 2008.

[5] V. Benci and D. Fortunato. An eigenvalue problem for the Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal.*, 11(2):283–293, 1998.

[6] H. Berestycki and P.L. Lions. Nonlinear scalar field equations, I, Existence of a ground state. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 82(4):313–346, 1983.

[7] S.J. Chen and C.L. Tang. Multiple solutions for nonhomogeneous Schrödinger-Maxwell and Klein-Gordon-Maxwell equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 17(5):559–574, 2010.

[8] G.M. Coclite. A multiplicity result for the nonlinear Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Commun. Appl. Anal.*, 7(2-3):417–423, 2003.

[9] T. D'Aprile and D. Mugnai. Solitary waves for nonlinear Klein-Gordon-Maxwell and Schrödinger-Maxwell equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 134(5):893–906, 2004.

[10] P. d'Avenia. Non-radially symmetric solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equation coupled with Maxwell equations. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 2(2):177–192, 2002.

[11] L. Jeanjean. On the existence of bounded Palais-Smale sequences and application to a Landsman-Lazer-type problem on $\mathbb{R}^N$. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 129(4):787–809, 2004.

[12] L. Jeanjean. and S.Le Coz An existence and stability result for standing waves of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Adv. Differential Equations*, 11(9-10):813–840, 2006.

[13] H. Kikuchi. On the existence of a solution for elliptic system related to the Maxwell-Schrödinger equations. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 67(5):1445–1456, 2007.

[14] H. Kikuchi. Existence and stability of standing waves for Schrödinger-Poisson-Slater equation. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 7(3):403–437, 2007.

[15] D. Ruiz. The Schrödinger-Poisson equation under the effect of a nonlinear local term. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 237(2):655–674, 2006.

[16] A. Salvatore. Multiple solitary waves for a non-homogeneous Schrödinger-Maxwell system in $\mathbb{R}^3$. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 6(2):157–169, 2006.

[17] M. Struwe. On the evolution of harmonic mappings of Riemannian surfaces. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 60(4):558–581, 1985.

[18] M.B. Yang and B.R. Li. Solitary waves for non-homogeneous Schöinger-Maxwell system. *Nonlinear Differ. Equ. Appl.*, 17(5):559–574, 2010.

[19] X.P. Zhu and H.S. Zhou. Existence of multiple positive solutions of inhomogeneous semilinear elliptic problems in unbounded domains. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 115(2):301–318, 1990.